PENDING CORRECTION AND APPROVAL AT THE 2023 MEETING

Minutes of the 2022 Pacific Division Executive Committee Meeting

Westin Bayshore, Vancouver
Wednesday, April 13, 2022


Guest: Amy Ferrer.

1. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting came to order at 3:00 PM.

2. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: The Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association acknowledges that it meets this year on the unceded traditional territory of the Musqueam, Squamish, and Tsleil-Waututh Nations.

3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA: The agenda was adopted.

4. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES: The minutes were adopted as published on the APA website.

5. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES: None raised.

6. REPORT OF ACTIONS BY EMAIL:

The Executive Committee added names to the list of philosophers approved for service on the divisional program committee.

The XC added names to the list of philosophers approved for service on the Nominating Committee.

The XC added names to the list of philosophers considered for the Dewey Lecture and voted (alongside the Program Committee) for a nominee (Margaret Gilbert).

DIVISIONAL BUSINESS

7. SECRETARY-TREASUER’S REPORT (Copenhaver):
Copenhaver thanked Macleod and the Program Committee for a spectacular program. This past year was exceptionally challenging. Macleod had to handle things that one would expect, e.g., frequently answering questions as to the conference’s status, how it would occur, and whether the Division had a contingency plan, but he has also dealt with much more than that. We usually don’t have many withdrawals prior to a meeting and there have been many more this year. We haven’t kept track of the exact number, but Macleod has fielded dozens
and dozens of withdrawal emails, as well as remote presentation requests—many of which came in over the last three days and well-after the requisite deadline, respectively. This is all to say that Macleod has to do more under worse circumstances than any Program Chair that Copenhaver has ever worked with in her time as Secretary-Treasurer or on the Program Committee. For that, Macleod has Copenhaver’s deepest gratitude. Copenhaver also thanked her assistant, Mallory Medeiros, for her crucial work on this year’s conference. She gave thanks to outgoing President Evan Thompson and outgoing Member-at-Large Vrinda Dalmiya for their years of service. The APA relies on and is fortunate to have service such as theirs.

Evan Thompson (Chair), Hannah Ginsborg, Ralph Wedgwood, and Rebecca Copenhaver (ex officio) served as the 2021–22 Nominating Committee. The Committee nominates the following for terms beginning July 1, 2022: Margaret Gilbert for Vice President, Carolyn Dicey Jennings for Member-at-Large, and Copenhaver for Secretary-Treasurer. Those nominations will go before the membership tomorrow at the Annual Business Meeting.

We did very well in terms of meeting our room-booking requirement. We have to meet a certain percentage of rooms booked in our hotel room block to get the free conference space. If we come below that percentage, we have to pay for every room. The percentage differs by contract, and this year, it was 85%. Even with COVID-related cancellations, we are still in the high 80s percentage-wise; prior to those cancellations, we were at about 92%. Ferrer explained that the APA tries to track numbers as closely as possible to make sure our room block number as close as possible to what it'll actually be. A requirement of 85% of rooms is good: we would like to see 75%, but hotels don’t want to do that—especially now. As of this morning, registration was in the mid-800s and Copenhaver expects those numbers to go up to about 1,000 by end of conference, which is only about 200 less than usual. This year’s registration numbers are really good and a good sign.

**Registration Rates:**
- Student Members 2018–2020: $35/$85
- APA Members 2018–2020: $120/$170

The Pacific Division’s funds are now managed through the central funds at the National Office. This is fiscally responsible and good for everyone. The budget is often released after the Pacific Division’s annual Executive Committee meeting, so Copenhaver doesn’t have it to present to the XC. She will send a copy of it to the XC within the next 1-2 months so they can look at it and ask any questions.

Overall, the Division is doing fine financially. Of course, having to cancel the 2020 meeting was a financial hit, but thanks to Ferrer’s tremendous work with the hotels, the hit was not nearly as big as it might have been. Part of what Ferrer did is renegotiate when the Divisions will have their meetings at certain hotels: e.g., Pacific 2023 will be in San Francisco and Pacific 2024 will be in Portland. Copenhaver explained that while the impact of the 2021 virtual meeting isn’t entirely clear, it doesn’t seem to have represented any significant financial loss. Ferrer added that the reason the 2021 APA meetings did better than projected and ended up with a larger budget surplus than projected is that the pricing of the meeting platform,
which was secured early on in the pandemic, is higher now than it was then. The four-day Eastern 2022 virtual meeting was about half the size of the six-day Eastern 2021 virtual meeting, but its platform cost more. The pricing that the APA secured for virtual meeting platforms in 2020 helped insulate us from some pandemic-related costs, but we won’t be able to get that pricing again.

Copenhaver thanked Ferrer and the National Office Staff for everything they’ve done over the last two and a half years. It has been a difficult time and the National Office hasn’t had much of a break at any point during it.

If the membership approves the Nominating Committee’s nomination of Copenhaver for Secretary-Treasurer at tomorrow’s ABM, she will gratefully accept and serve a third and final term. Copenhaver’s goals for a final term are as follows: (1) get the Division back into stable schedules and practices after the tumultuous past few years and (2) help the Executive Committee search for the next Secretary-Treasurer. The search is officially only the XC’s responsibility, but she’ll help them figure out how they’d like to go about conducting the search. The Secretary-Treasurer doesn’t just work on the annual meeting (e.g., bargaining with hotels, finding good program chairs), they also represent the Division and its interest on the National Board of Officers. The Divisions are separate from each other and in some sense separate from the National Board, so that is a complex system that requires a lot of diplomacy, good will, flexibility, and creativity. The National Board is made up of approximately thirty people, including past, present, future Presidents, Committee Chairs, and Members Representative of the Board—all of whom serve overlapping three-year terms. As a result, there is only a small number of people a Board meeting whose time on the Board spans across those terms and who have institutional memory of the APA. If the Pacific Secretary-Treasurer serves more than one term, they are one of the people who represents institutional memory and that provides a kind of stability to the process that is incredibly important. Copenhaver emphasized the position’s complexity to indicate that the people considered ought to have experience as Program Committee Members and ideally will have served as Program Chair and served on one or more APA Committees. If Copenhaver is approved for a final term, the next Secretary-Treasurer will ideally shadow Copenhaver for a year, as she did with her predecessor, Dom Lopes. The timeline on this is flexible: if she is voted in, Copenhaver is happy to serve a shorter term instead of the standard three years if that is what works best.

All three Divisions, working through the Divisional Coordinating Committee, with knowledge of the budget and hotels, are unanimous in concluding that we cannot, in the foreseeable future, host hybrid conferences. The cost of hardline rooms plus the reduction in meeting the room block, which is what gets us the conference space, make a hybrid conference fiscally impossible. If hotels change their business practices either with respect to room blocks or what technology is standardly in rooms, we can revisit that. As of 2023, barring significant outbreaks, the Pacific Division is returning to its prior policy regarding remote presentation: it will only be offered only in cases of accessibility accommodation or government restriction accommodation and applying for it will have a deadline of approximately sixty days prior to the conference. Copenhaver anticipates that now that people are accustomed to using Zoom, they will expect, e.g., to be able to attend remotely, that AV in APA meeting rooms will be sufficient for remote presentation. We will need to
tell people early that these expectations cannot be met—likely in the fall because of when the Eastern meeting occurs—so that they aren’t surprised. Thus, a task when planning the next Pacific meeting will be to communicate the return to our prior remote presentation policy. Copenhaver emphasized that this return is distinct from what is proposed by the 2 + 1 campaign.

Copenhaver thanked the Executive Committee for their service. Their service is often unacknowledged and unrewarded at their home institutions, so it matters a great deal that they are at the heart of keeping the APA thriving, especially under these trying circumstances.

Shiffrin asked a question about the change in publishers’ presence at the conference. For example, Oxford University Press isn’t here this year. Ferrer will ask Deputy Director Mike Morris about OUP. She explained that this year has been more complicated because some companies have issued moratoriums on travel. We will continue to keep an eye on it, but this year and this particular conference aren’t good indicators of publishers’ presence because we don’t know whether external factors are one-off or a pattern. Next year will be a better indicator. Copenhaver noted that prior to the pandemic, the National Office was working with publishing houses on what would be more attractive to them: our numbers went significantly up as a result and we have ongoing good relationships with them.

Macleod asked if a letter could be issued to the chair of the Program Chair’s department at their home institution for them to receive recognition there for their work on a Pacific meeting. Copenhaver has asked about course releases for Program Chairs and she will incorporate Macleod’s suggestion.

8. REPORT OF THE REPRESENTATIVE TO THE BOARD (Burroughs):
Burroughs reported highlights from the winter meeting of the APA Board of Officers, which took place on February 15, 2022.

The Board heard a report given by Kate Norlock, Chair of the Committee on the Status of Women after some questions about Committee’s scope and its work. The Committee suggested that its name/title be rethought to be more inclusive of gender identities, though no specific name was put forth at that time. There was sympathy for the idea but also some concern that the Committee needs to be the committee that it is because women’s issues aren’t resolved in philosophy. There was also discussion that Lori Gruen, in her capacity as rising Chair, will be talking to the Committee on LGBTQ People in the Profession about this proposal for areas of overlap or collaboration.

There were brief reports of the three divisional meetings. The Eastern meeting had in-person and online components. Registration was what you’d expect and there wasn’t dramatic drop-off. There was also discussion about the cost of AV. The cost of AV was between $40,000 and $60,000, which is very high. Here, Ferrer explained that the cost is so high because hotels make their money from food, beverages, and AV.

At the time of the Board meeting, the Task Force on Academic Publishing was in need of a chair. Ferrer provided an update. There is someone who is ready to be chair, contingent upon a relatively minor change to the Task Force’s charge. Essentially the potential chair
thought that the charge is too broad in scope for the committee to take on so that will be scaled back. The board will probably take on the change as a consent agenda at the main meeting and hopefully the chair will be installed after the meeting.

The Diversity and Inclusive Grant Program has returned to full funding. This is $20,000 worth of funding, which can be one $20,000 grant or two $10,000 grants to support diversity-inclusive programs in the profession. A call has gone out for proposals and the submission deadline is June 2022.

The Board received a petition for it to sign onto the Barcelona Principles for a Globally Inclusive Philosophy, which aim to address the disadvantages non-native English speakers face when publishing in English language—particularly analytic—philosophy journals. It discussed the principles, which include the suggestion that publishers don’t give “undue weight to author’s linguistic style, fluency, or accent.” It discussed how on the one hand, non-native English speakers should not be put at a disadvantage, but on the other hand, it seems important to consider linguistic style and fluency when evaluating a paper for a journal. The Board did not sign onto the Barcelona Principles, but some Board Members may have initially signed onto them in their personal capacities.

9. REPORT OF THE CEO OF THE APA (Ferrer):

Public Statements: Since about 2016, a major theme for the Board has been the increased need for statements on issues of public interest. At past meetings, Ferrer read a summary of all of the statements that the Board signed in the past year. Given the number of statements that the Board signed onto in the past year, she instead directed the XC to apaonline.org/statements, which contains all of the statements that the Board has signed. Largely, the Board has been signing statements on COVID-related issues, various international conflicts, and threats to the humanities.

Satz asked about how many statements the Board signed onto in the past year. Ferrer said the Board signed approximately two dozen, which is dramatically higher than in past years. At the start of Ferrer’s time at the APA (2012), the Board would sign a small handful of statements each year, doing so when the need arose. When the need to sign statements—often quickly—increased, the APA created the Committee on Public Statements, which consists of twelve of the Board’s twenty-nine members. The Committee consults with the Board and if there is Board consensus, the Committee can take action on the Board’s behalf. Having the Committee has been very helpful. Because of it, we are able to respond with statements within a few days—sometimes within twenty-four to thirty-six hours. In non-profit governance, when you don’t have a meeting, you have to have unanimity and the Committee allows us to move away from that unanimity requirement while still getting consensus. Ferrer expects the desire for the APA to sign onto statements will continue at approximately the current rate based on what is going on in the world, what is going on in academia, and the fact that doing so is now an established practice of scholarly societies. The APA doesn’t always issue its own statements: it also signs onto statements written by our partners who organize joint statements (e.g., the American Historical Association). Signing onto statements is easier to do for a variety of reasons.
Grants Received and Awarded:

- In 2021, we completed our fourth year of our second term of our Mellon Grant to support undergraduate diversity institutes (e.g., PIKSI programs). We received a no-cost extension on that grant because of the pandemic and the fact that much of that funding went to institutions that happened virtually or not at all and so didn’t spend travel funding, which was a huge part of their budget. Our extension is currently through 2022. Ferrer is about to apply for another one-year, no-cost extension and has received preliminary approval it to spend the remaining funds because the 2022 extension was predicated on having in-person institutes in 2021, which did not happen.

- As Burroughs mentioned in the Report of the Representative to the Board, we also have all grant programs restored to pre-pandemic levels.

- Over the course of the pandemic, Ferrer has been able to secure a number of government loans and grants to help keep the APA running and keep our staff employed. She secured two Paycheck Protection Program loans of $130,000 each and a $150,000 Economic Injury Disaster Loan (EIDL). Those loans came in during 2022 from the U.S. Small Business Administration. The Paycheck Protection Program loans were both fully forgiven and are now effectively grants. The EIDL loan is structured like a mortgage: it is a low-interest rate and we’ll make a monthly payment over the course of the next thirty years. Essentially, it cost us a few hundred dollars a month to get money that we really needed when we really needed it. There is, however, no prepayment penalty so if we are able to make larger payments, we can.

- Ferrer also secured a $195,000 grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) through their American Rescue Plan funding. That grant is solely to support APA staff salaries and that funding is what allowed us to restore grant programs to pre-pandemic levels because we didn’t have to put that money into paying staff.

Other Items of Note from the Past Year:

- The Board also approved a budget for fiscal year 2022 in May 2021 that showed initially a net loss/deficit of $84,000. In light of the NEH funding (not all of the NEH funding will be part of this fiscal year but a good portion of it was) and the additional costs, especially around the Eastern Division meeting, we revised that budget in December 2021. On the revised budget, the net loss/deficit is $38,000. The budget is about $1.5 million dollars. While we would love to not have a deficit, a net loss of $38,000 is essentially a break-even budget for us because we do have an endowment that allows us to weather modest deficits like that.

- In addition to the review of the Committee on the Status of Women, over the summer the Board also had a review of the Committee on the Rights of Professional Philosophers. The Committee has had some challenges in figuring out how to move forward with its charge because its charge has typically been to recommend censure of institutions based on investigations of professional rights violations. Censures are increasingly dangerous from a liability standpoint and they are especially dangerous if you don’t have all of the information. Institutions are far less likely now to give information out because they are concerned about litigation. One of the things the Board asked that Committee to do is to look at their charge and see what other scholarly societies are doing. To Ferrer’s knowledge, there is only one other scholarly
society that has the idea of censure anymore: most have gotten rid of it because it’s so problematic. The Committee will be coming back to the Board with a revised charge—both its current Chair and incoming Associate Chair, who will become Chair at the end of the current Chair’s term, are really interested in trying to solve this problem.

- Hard-copy mailing of the proceedings have been changed from opt-out to opt-in. This saved us quite a bit of money and reduces our climate impact.
- The Board established a Working Group on Student Evaluations of Teaching. That Group has one recommendation that the Board will take up at the main meeting and they expect to have more substantive recommendations possibly by the fall.
- A replacement for John Heil, inaugural Editor-in-Chief of the Journal of the American Philosophical Association, has been found: Heather Battaly. Battaly’s term begins at the start of next year. She previously served on this body and has served as an associate editor of the APA Journal.
- The Board put forward the proposals around the 2 + 1 model and the bylaws amendments, which will be discussed next.
- The Board approved the strategic plan, which was announced in 2021 and we are now pursing the goals laid out in it.
- We received a clean audit. Our staff has only had case of staff turnover in last several years, which occurred around this time last year: Lon Marcus, the new Staff Accountant, is fantastic.

Ferrer continues to represent the APA in the American Council of Learned Societies, the Delaware Humanities, the Academic Philosophy Data and Analysis project, and the National Humanities Alliance to help make sure that philosophers and the APA have a voice in those groups. She has just rotated off the ACLS’s Conference of Executive Officers and the NHA’s Board.

10. PROPOSAL FOR THE APA 2+1 CAMPAIGN:
Copenhaver explained that Philosophers for Sustainability, which is not a part of the APA, has proposed a 2 + 1 model (https://www.philosophersforsustainability.com/apa-2-plus-1-campaign/) in which one Divisional meeting per year would be held virtually, and that virtual meeting would rotate between the Divisions. The first opportunity to begin this model would be in 2025 with the Central Division, as hotels for the Eastern and Pacific meetings are booked through 2025.

We surveyed the membership regarding virtual meetings and asked:
- How often the member attends APA meetings;
- Whether the member attended the APA virtual meetings;
- Whether in a 2 + 1 scenario, the member would be more, less, or as likely to attend a virtual meeting than an in-person meeting;
- Whether the member would be willing to accept an increase registration fees to support the 2 + 1 model;
- Whether the members institution would offer funding support for a virtual conference; and
- How important it is for the member for the APA to adopt the 2 + 1 model.
On the desirability of virtual versus in-person meetings responses were all over the map. Some were against virtual meetings altogether, some thought we should only hold virtual meetings, and a lot were in-between. Further results, which are a version of the summary given by Divisional Coordinating Committee Chair Richard Bett, are as follows:

1. There was widespread puzzlement at the idea that virtual meetings could require increasing the registration fees. The truth is we don’t yet have good information about whether the 2 + 1 model would be as, more, or less costly overall to the Divisions and the APA.

2. A lot of people said we should move to hybrid meetings. This is prohibitively expensive.

3. It was suggested that we should be more imaginative in how we envision virtual meetings: they should not have the same format as in-person meetings, but just on a screen as opposed to in a hotel room; instead, we should experiment with different models altogether. This was not a widely expressed view, and we didn’t get a clear sense of what these alternative formats might be; but the point is worth pursuing. We don’t yet know what a new format would look like, but thanks to Ferrer’s work with, e.g., the ACLS, we can find out how other academic societies do this.

4. Predictably, there was a repeated suggestion that we should have fewer meetings combined with a call to reform or abolish the divisional structure. This is ruled out by our bylaws, which require that we hold one meeting per division. In addition, in Copenhaver’s personal experience (not in her capacity as Secretary-Treasurer), what people are envisioning are coastal conferences. In her opinion, this would serve our members unequally.

5. There was concern that a switch to some virtual meetings would not in fact reduce our environmental impact. A smaller number of in-person meetings could still be attended by just as many people, in total, as have traditionally attended the three meetings.

6. A GSC concern was that if the shift meant that graduate students attended fewer in-person meetings, this would hurt their networking opportunities.

7. A third GSC concern was that feedback is plausibly less helpful, and attendance lower, at virtual than at in-person meetings, which means that a switch to virtual meetings could negatively affect graduate students’ philosophical growth.

8. A fourth GSC concern was that a switch to virtual meetings would lead universities to reduce or eliminate funding for in-person meetings. A lot of survey respondents expressed similar concerns.

Rationale: The data we have comes from a very small sample size — the three virtual meetings held in 2021 — and unrepresentative of what would occur were we to switch to a 2 + 1 in a non-pandemic world. As a result, the Divisional Coordinating Committee agreed that if all three Divisional XCs were to adopt the following proposal, then we could try an experimental run of the 2 + 1 to gather the data needed to make more fully-informed decisions.
Proposal: The Pacific Division agrees to join the Central and Eastern Division in experimenting with the 2 + 1 model, beginning with the Central Division in 2025. The 2 + 1 model is that one Divisional meeting per year be virtual, while the other two are in-person, and that the virtual meeting would rotate evenly among the three Divisions. The purpose of the experiment is to gather the information needed to make a fully informed judgment based on attendance, costs, desirability, funding impacts, and other consequences of the model.

Discussion: Ferrer said that if the Pacific Division agrees to the experiment, the Central XC asked for the immediate creation of a task force or working group to look at structures of and approaches to virtual meetings. This force/group would include some people from Philosophers from Sustainability and with some people with a healthy skepticism about virtual meetings to deal with challenges such as different time zones, low attendance levels at some sessions, and ensuring appropriate participation. Some people from Philosophers from Sustainability attended the Central ABM and will likely attend the Pacific ABM tomorrow to express their interest in the experiment going forward and willingness to help make this feasible by being on a committee. The committee won’t be able to prescribe or direct, but it will put together recommendations that each Division can consider for itself when planning its virtual meeting during the experiment.

Having taught for several years online, Satz expressed skepticism about virtual meetings and the quality of conversation. She asked whether the bylaws could be amended to provide for only two meetings a year, with the two meetings rotating between the Divisions. Copenhaver responded this suggestion as a possibility but that she doesn’t think it is likely to happen. She also doubts that the Philosophers of Sustainability would think that it is sustainable because some people who aren’t in favor of virtual meetings have questioned whether on the 2 + 1 model, those who would’ve attended the virtual meeting in-person if it were in-person will just travel to one of the in-person meetings instead.

Shiffrin asked whether the committee that the Central XC asked for would form measurements to assess the experiment. She is a little more optimistic about the 2 + 1 model because she thinks a lot of people attend two conferences a year so there are repeat players whose travel will be reduced and that the model may expand global access to one of the APA’s annual conferences. She is, however, concerned about the GSC’s worry about networking and hopes that if the Division agrees to join the experiment, the committee would create plans to address that problem.

Shiffrin asked why, with respect to the hybrid costs, we wouldn’t consider holding conferences at universities, which would charge us less for setup. Copenhaver explained that most universities that can accommodate an APA conference could only do so in the summer, when most classes aren’t in session. With the exception of a few places, many universities aren’t located in a place that is not only easy to travel to but also easily lends itself to informal social gatherings (e.g., easily accessible restaurants). Copenhaver isn’t sure but suspects that universities would also charge a lot for AV because of financial issues that they are facing. But this doesn’t, however, mean that the cost wouldn’t be lower. Sager noted that universities can be fickle in terms of conference planning. Shiffrin replied that this is because conferences aren’t held in the same place every year. Sager clarified that he meant because universities
don't have the infrastructure to support conferences: conference planning can be contingent up on finding the right people (e.g., provosts) at the right time. Ferrer highlighted the issue of physical space in terms of housing attendees on campus or nearby enough, which is not an issue that arises when having a conference in essentially one building. She said that if the Division agrees to participate in the 2 + 1 model experiment, it may be that more people attend the in-person meetings, causing us to grow out of some of the hotels that we currently meet at and change the way that our meeting contracts work. Another thing that could happen is that many people attend the virtual meeting and the in-person meetings shrink, allowing us to consider places that we are currently too big for. APA meetings haven’t been held at universities for decades because of the problems that Copenhaver mentioned, but a positive of the 2 +1 model experiment is that it could let us see how in-person meetings might change.

Vaidya brought up the fact that there are different ways to define “hybrid.” One definition is that a non-mixed mode conference, with an in-person component where no one is allowed to present or attend virtually and an online component where anyone can attend but the online component is hosted by a private corporation rather than the in-person venue. In-person attendees at the venue can engage in the online component by using the WiFi in their hotel rooms. Another is a mixed-mode hybrid, where people can present and attend talks in-person and virtually—this is the type of hybrid that raises a conference’s costs. We don’t know how attractive a non-mixed mode conference would be to people, but Vaidya suspects the cost would be significantly lower. He suggests that the membership be asked about their interest in a non-mixed mode conference.

Copenhaver said this is something we could definitely include on a survey and put to the task force. Ferrer said that this is essentially what the Eastern 2022 conference ended up being out of necessity because of the Omicron variant. However, the in-person and online didn’t flow into each other and weren’t simultaneous because that’s not possible given the number of APA staff members (there are nine including Ferrer). Functionally, the 2022 Eastern conference was three-weeks long: the four days of virtual sessions were split over two weeks to avoid Zoom fatigue (two consecutive days in one week, two consecutive days in another). The online parts didn’t involve hotel costs for facilitating remote presentation, but there was the platform cost and every online session had to be staffed by an APA staff member or volunteer or we had to pay the platform to provide a host. Platform costs are dramatically higher than they used to be. Eastern 2022 was not only extraordinarily difficult from a staffing perspective and program committee perspective, but also dramatically more expensive.

Copenhaver emphasized how APA staff had to go from the three-week Eastern conference to the Central conference to the Pacific conference this year. Ferrer said that sibling scholarly societies have tried different things. One tried to do offer in-person and online components at the same time and even with its staff of 150, found it to be a monumental challenge. Because of hotel contracts, Omicron, pivoting, etc. many of our sister societies are transiting to a dual-format but are doing the meetings at different times. For example, the American Historical Association had its in-person meeting in January and virtual portion of that meeting was last week. The AHA’s plan in future years is largely to start having virtual events (e.g., virtual webinars, virtual conference) and keep their in-person conference as in-person.
Vaidya asked if it was possible to have the nine APA staff members only doing an in-person component and having an outside company handle a virtual meeting. Ferrer answered that platform companies do offer that level of support, but it would cost us as much as the platform and then some, especially given the number of concurrent sessions (it is an hourly cost).

Based on what staff members who were staffing those sessions had to do in/during them, Ferrer has concerns about platform support personnel being able to manage APA-specific issues (e.g., pending APA membership renewal, uncertainty as to whether a participant registered for the conference). Sager said it’d basically entail planning two conferences, which Copenhaver described as a nightmare for a Secretary-Treasurer and a Program Chair.

Sager said he is sympathetic to the experiment but like Shiffrin, wants to know its anticipated effects. He thinks that universities don’t charge the Canadian Philosophical Association as much for setup the way that hotels charge the APA. He also noted that university classrooms are already set up for remote access. One thing he has noticed with CPA meetings is while a conference venue must be easy to get to and large enough, the university’s location isn’t that important. For example, the University of British Columbia isn’t near hotels but that has never been a problem. Sometimes, at least in the Canadian context, it is a point of pride for a university to host a conference like the CPA. Moreover, pitching hosting an APA conference as being environmentally friendly may help. In terms of changing the bylaws requirement of each Division having its own meeting, Sager thinks that if there is a good proposal and the cause is substantial enough, consideration should be given.

Copenhaver noted that the people attend conferences for different reasons and the social aspect is a draw for some people. She said that if the XC agrees to the experiment, Shiffrin’s and Sager’s concerns would be at the forefront of what a task force would consider: the metrics would be contained. The questions that would probably be answered first are related to attendance at virtual sessions, attendance at in-person sessions (which we already track to some extent), and the costs. Sager is less concerned about the quality of an online discussion with professional academics (as opposed to undergraduate students in a class). Although in-person networking is useful for some graduate students, said it may be worth considering how a virtual conference is more advantageous for some people who aren’t as comfortable networking in-person—though perhaps philosophy’s structure shouldn’t be based on how well one circulates at a conference.

Thompson said that since the Central and Eastern XCs have already agreed to the experiment, it seems reasonable for the Pacific XC to do so as well. He doesn’t see how we can have the right information to make decisions in the future if we don’t experiment. Thompson emphasized the importance of metrics (e.g., attendance, effect on graduate students) and keep tracking of them because if we don’t keep close track of them, they’re useless. He didn’t see any reason not to join the experiment.

Sager thought the Pacific Division should join the experiment. He noted that in-person conferences aren’t accessible for some people many reasons. Bringing it back to the Board’s consideration of the Barcelona Principles, he brought up the possibility of holding sessions in languages other than English. There are a lot of opportunities to experiment. In terms of
the GSC’s networking concern, there are ways to network online and there is also a dark side to networking. Another bonus of doing the experiment is that some prospective attendees wouldn’t have to arrange child care when attending that year’s virtual meeting.

Satz wasn’t opposed to the experiment but thought that the larger online conferences are, the more difficult they are. She was open to trying and seeing what we learn from the experiment. Data shows that low-income students are less likely to engage online and she worried how an online conference would affect graduate students. In-person meetings do a lot of things beyond sharing information.

Burroughs was also in favor of the experiment. Although we lose things without in-person interaction, there is opportunity in terms of how flexible the conference in terms of online structure. Burroughs thought that flexibility matters and being stuck with the traditional APA session structure would make for a poorer online experience.

Copenhaver thought that part of the idea behind the experiment is to not think of an online meeting as being beholden to traditional APA session structures. She said the best-case scenario for the structure/attendance aspect of the experiment is taking structures introduced/created online and bring them to in-person meetings to shake things up.

Thompson reiterated that if the XC says no, the experiment in its current form will not take place. Ferrer confirmed but noted that the Central and Eastern Divisions could decide to do their own version together if the Pacific Division doesn’t take part in the experiment. Thompson liked (3) from the results from the survey of the membership. In regards to low attendance at some APA sessions, Thompson recounted past experiences of attending sessions with low attendance in large rooms over his fifteen years of attending APA meetings. Copenhaver’s concern about numbers relates to the prestige for a junior faculty member or graduate student having a colloquium paper accepted and how rattling it is for them to see an empty room—in-person or virtually. She said junior faculty and graduate students are a cohort that we should especially care about.

The proposal was passed unanimously. The Pacific Division will take part in the 2 + 1 model experiment with the Central and Eastern Divisions.

11. PROPOSED BYLAWS AMENDMENTS: Ferrer summarized the proposed bylaws amendments, which will be reviewed at the Annual Business Meeting tomorrow. Bylaws amendments must be reviewed at the Divisions’ Annual Business Meetings before they go to the membership for a vote.

**Background and Motion:** As discussed at the fall 2020 APA board meeting, the Committee on Divisional Coordination has undertaken an effort to review and update the procedures laid out in the APA bylaws around resolutions and amendments. The five amendments summarized below are the results of that review. Our goals in reviewing and updating these procedures were to provide both increased flexibility and increased protections against resolutions and amendments that could present unreasonable risk to the association. During the review, we also identified housekeeping changes that needed to be made to the bylaws.
The Committee on Divisional Coordination asks that the Board propose the five amendments presented in this document. The Committee also proposes that the Board declare all five motions as concerning Divisional business and refer them to the Divisions for presentation at their 2022 Business Meeting meetings.

**Amendment 1: Establish Review Procedure for Resolutions and Amendments**

The current APA bylaws do not provide protection against the adoption of resolutions and amendments that are inconsistent with the APA’s mission, or pose threats to the association or its nonprofit status. The proposed amendments would establish a procedure for the APA board of officers to review proposed resolutions or amendments for consistency with the APA mission, nonprofit law, and the board’s fiduciary duty to the association. The amendment also makes small edits to subsections 5.5.A, 5.5.B, 5.5.C, and 5.5.G to clarify the procedures for proposing and adopting resolutions.

**Proposed Bylaws**

*Article 5—Meetings of the Association*

5.5. Resolutions

A. Only resolutions that are adopted either by a special meeting of the association or by all three divisions within a twelve-month period shall be recorded and publicized as resolutions of the association. They shall otherwise be recorded and publicized only as resolutions of the board or of one or more of the divisions.

B. A resolution adopted by the board of officers shall, at the request of the board be placed on the agenda of a special meeting of the association or on the agenda of a divisional business meeting of each of the three divisions in the twelve-month period following announcement to the members of the action of the board.

C. A resolution adopted by a divisional business meeting shall, at the request of that business meeting or the divisional executive committee, be placed on the agenda of the next business meetings of the other two divisions following announcement to the members of the first division’s action.

D. The chair of the board of officers shall be notified of all resolutions adopted or referred to a vote by any divisional business meeting as soon after the meeting as is feasible.

E. Any resolution purporting to represent the sense of a division or the association on a matter of public policy, and any other resolution for which the chair of the board determines it is appropriate, shall be reviewed by the board of officers prior to being implemented or being put to a vote. Such a resolution is not in order and may not be put to a vote if the board of officers finds that any of the following conditions obtains:

1. The resolution is inconsistent with the APA’s mission and purpose.
2. The resolution impedes the board’s ability to carry out its fiduciary responsibilities.
3. The resolution contains erroneous, tortious, or possibly libelous statements.
4. The resolution may pose a threat to the association’s continuing operation as a tax-exempt organization.

F. In the case that the board of officers makes any finding that renders a resolution out of order and not to be put to a vote, the chair of the board of officers will report on the board’s decision at the next business meeting(s) of the division(s) considering the resolution, or at a special meeting of the association, after which the resolution may be reformulated and reconsidered.
G. When presented with a resolution, a divisional business meeting may vote to adopt the resolution directly, vote not to adopt the resolution, or put the resolution to a mail, electronic mail, or secure electronic ballot of the members affiliated with that division. If a resolution is put to a vote, the divisional executive committee shall establish all relevant dates for the voting process, such as the date of ballot distribution and the deadline for returning ballots.

...  

Article 11 — Amendments  
11.1. Amendments  
...  

B. Any proposed amendment to the bylaws will be subject to the following approval process:  
1. Any proposed amendment shall be reviewed by the board of officers prior to being implemented or being put to a vote. Such an amendment is not in order and may not be put to a vote if the board of officers finds that any of the following conditions obtains:  
   a. The amendment is inconsistent with the APA’s mission and purpose.  
   b. The amendment impedes the board’s ability to carry out its fiduciary responsibilities.  
   c. The amendment may pose a threat to the association’s continuing operation as a tax-exempt organization.  
In the case that the board of officers makes any finding that renders an amendment out of order and not to be put to a vote, the chair of the board of officers will report on the board’s decision to the body proposing the amendment, after which the amendment may be reformulated and reconsidered.

Amendment 2: Provide Clarity and Flexibility for Business and Special Meetings  
The current bylaws provide for divisional business meetings only at annual divisional meetings. They also describe special in-person meetings of the association, but these have rarely, if ever, been held. The pandemic has made clear the importance of providing increased flexibility for meetings, including holding them virtually when appropriate. Creating additional flexibility for such meetings would also allow for the consideration of resolutions on a shorter timeline than is currently possible.

The amendment will do the following:  
• Allow divisions to call business meetings separate from the regular annual meeting.  
• Remove the requirement that the divisions hold a business meeting at their regular annual meeting; replace it with a requirement that the divisions each hold a business meeting at least once per year.  
• Clarify the procedures for conducting special meetings of the association.  
• Allow both divisional business meetings and special meetings of the association to be held virtually.  
• Move a provision about voting procedures at meetings from Article 5.1 to Article 5.2.

Proposed Bylaws  
Article 5 — Meetings of the Association  
5.1. Regular Meetings  
...
B. Each regular meeting shall include an appropriate philosophical program, a presidential address, and such other events as the divisional executive committee may deem fitting and consonant with the purpose of the association.
C. Meetings arranged in whole or in part by a division shall be held at times and places within or without the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as shall be set by the divisional executive committee in consultation with the executive director of the association. Any other meetings shall be held at times and places within or without the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as shall be set by the chair of the board in consultation with the executive director of the association.

5.2. Divisional Business Meetings
A. At least once per year there will be a divisional business meeting at which reports of the board on the affairs of the association and of the divisional executive committee on the affairs of the division shall be presented.
B. Divisions may hold additional business meetings as decided by the divisional executive committee. Business meetings outside the regular meeting must be announced, along with a proposed agenda for the meeting, to the members affiliated with the division at least ten (10) days prior to the meeting. Business meetings held separate from the regular meeting must either be convened remotely (such as via phone or video conference) or a method of remote participation must be provided to accommodate members not able to attend in person.
C. At each divisional business meeting, regular members whose voting affiliation is with the division hosting the business meeting shall have an opportunity to vote on such matters that require a vote, in accordance with these bylaws or the bylaws of the division. Acts taken at a divisional business meeting shall constitute acts of that division.
D. Voting at divisional business meetings shall be in the manner specified in the bylaws of each division. Where no method of voting is specified in the division's bylaws, voting at divisional business meetings may occur in person or by mail, electronic mail, or secure electronic ballot.

5.3. Special Meetings
A. Special meetings of the association may, given at least one month's notice, be called by the board of officers or upon the request of 10 percent of the regular members of the association. The notice of a special meeting shall specify the general nature of the business to be transacted at the meeting, including the texts of any substantive motions to be considered.
B. Special meetings of the association must either be convened remotely (such as via phone or video conference) or a method of remote participation must be provided to accommodate members not able to attend in person.
C. At each special meeting of the association, regular members shall have an opportunity to vote on such matters that require a vote, in accordance with these bylaws. Acts taken at a special meeting of the association shall constitute acts of the association.
D. Voting on the business to be transacted at the Special Meeting, as specified in the meeting notice, may occur in person or by mail, electronic mail, or secure electronic ballot of all regular members of the association.

Amendment 3: Set a Minimum Threshold for Public Policy Resolutions
Currently, the adoption of a resolution purporting to represent sense of a division or the association on a matter of public policy can be adopted by a simple majority of ballots submitted, even if only a tiny fraction of the membership participates in the vote. To ensure that such resolutions are only adopted when there is strong support from the membership, this proposed amendment establishes a minimum threshold of participation that must be met for a resolution to be adopted on a matter of public policy: 10% of the members of the division or the association (depending on how the resolution is proposed) must vote in support of the resolution.

**Proposed Bylaws**

*Article 5 – Meetings of the Association*

5.5. Resolutions

... H. Resolutions that, as determined by a majority vote of the board of officers or of at least one divisional executive committee, purport to represent the sense of a division or the association on matters of public policy may be adopted only by mail, electronic mail, or secure electronic ballot of the members affiliated with that division, in the case of resolutions before a divisional business meeting; or of all regular members of the association, in the case of resolutions before a special meeting of the association. Such mail, electronic mail, or secure electronic ballots will provide relevant minutes of all divisional business meetings and special meetings of the association at which the resolution was considered and a summary of the arguments presented.

I. Resolutions purporting to represent the sense of a division on matters of public policy will be adopted only if both of the following conditions are met:

1. A majority of the members submitting ballots vote to adopt the resolution.

2. The number of members voting in favor of adopting the resolution is at least ten percent of the total number of members affiliated with that division as of the last day of the voting period.

J. Resolutions purporting to represent the sense of the association on matters of public policy will be adopted only if both of the following conditions are met:

1. A majority of the members submitting ballots vote to adopt the resolution.

2. The number of members voting in favor of adopting the resolution is at least ten percent of the total number of regular members of the association as of the last day of the voting period.

**Amendment 4: Streamline Divisional Review of Bylaws Amendments**

The procedure for amending the APA bylaws requires that proposed amendments be presented to divisional business meetings for review. The divisional business meetings do not vote for or against proposed amendments—amendments are simply presented for discussion. However, the current bylaws allow for business meetings to amend proposed amendments—a procedural step that can draw out the amendment process, since the same proposed language must be presented to all three divisional business meetings before it can be put to a vote. This amendment would streamline the process so that divisional business meetings must discuss proposed bylaws amendments but cannot amend them.

This proposed amendment also includes minor edits to clarify the amendment process.
Proposed Bylaws

Article 11 — Amendments

11.1. Amendments

... 2. Any proposed amendment to the bylaws that, within 30 days of its proposal, is determined, by a majority vote of the board of officers or by a majority vote by at least one executive committee of a division, to concern the business of the divisions must be presented for discussion at a business meeting of each of the three divisions, and must be announced to the regular members at least 30 days in advance of the first divisional business meeting at which it is discussed. Following discussion, the proposed amendment must be submitted to a mail, electronic mail, or secure electronic ballot in each division. Adoption of a proposed amendment requires a majority of the votes cast in each of the three divisional mail, electronic mail, or secure electronic ballots.

3. Any proposed amendment to the bylaws that is not determined according to Article 11.1.B.2 to concern the business of the divisions must be presented to the members for review via the APA website for at least 60 days prior to a vote. Following the review period, the proposed amendment must be submitted to a mail, electronic mail, or secure electronic ballot of APA members. Adoption of the proposed amendment requires a majority of the votes cast in the mail, electronic mail, or secure electronic ballot.

Amendment 5: Housekeeping/Corrections

This amendment makes the following two housekeeping changes to the bylaws:

• Deletes language about serving as associate editor of APA publications from the description of the secretary-treasurer role. This language dates back to when the secretary-treasurers served as associate editors of the issues of the Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association that pertained to their respective divisional meetings. The secretary-treasurers no longer serve in that role because the meeting programs are no longer part of the Proceedings.

• Deletes a provision intended to allow the APA board of officers to vote by email. Nonprofit law in Pennsylvania, where the APA is incorporated, does not allow for board votes by email.

Proposed Bylaws

Article 6 — Divisions of the Association

6.3. Officers of the Divisions.

... B. Each division shall be free to determine the duties of its officers, provided that:

2. The secretary keep records of the division;

...

Article 7 — Board of the Association

... [Delete existing section 7.11. Actions of the Board outside Board Meetings and renumber existing section 7.12. to 7.11.]

12. PROPOSAL: DIVISIONALLY-SHARED ACCOMODATIONS BUDGET

(Copenhaver):
History: Although the budgets for all three Divisions are managed through the National Office, strictly speaking each Division’s budget is separate and budget matters are overseen in consultation with the Secretary-Treasurers.

Rationale: Each Division has a budget line for Accessibility Accommodations. However, for any given annual meeting, and any given Division, costs of accommodations can vary substantially. This makes responsible budget planning difficult. The Eastern and Central Divisions have already approved the following proposal to split yearly accommodation costs equally among the three Divisions.

Proposal: The Pacific Division agrees to join the Central and Eastern Division to split yearly accommodation costs equally among the three Divisions.

The proposal was passed unanimously.

13. SUGGESTIONS FOR THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE (Copenhaver): The XC approved a list of candidates for the nominating committee. XC members were encouraged to send Copenhaver/all XC members additional names via email.

ANNUAL MEETING PROGRAM BUSINESS

14. REPORT OF THE PROGRAM CHAIR (Macleod): Macleod provided a report to the Executive Committee and summarized it for the Committee.

Statistics: The numbers in regards to submissions, acceptance rates, program personnel, and sessions are all within their normal range. Nothing stands out as bearing comment. Distribution of sessions among Program Committee Members was roughly even: some did have a bit more than others, but that is normal.

Challenges: The Program Committee faced three main challenges: the impact of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, volunteer lists, and communication protocols.

The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic made many uncertain as to whether Pacific 2022 would indeed occur in-person. Macleod field many questions about whether remote presentation was possible, whether a hybrid format might be adopted, and whether there was a pivot plan to move to online if pandemic conditions worsened. The general uncertainty about the conference’s status affected the PC’s recruitment efforts for chairs and commentators. Macleod reached out to chairs of departments that are near the venue to recruit their graduate students and even then, finding chairs and commentators was difficult. Since the meeting is held in Vancouver, many participants would have to cross an international border and meet various COVID-19 protocols. Together, these difficulties caused the Committee to run quite far behind the usual timeline for finalizing the program. Nonetheless, the PC worked diligently to find chairs and commentators. There have been quite a few COVID-related cancellations in the days leading up to the meeting and the Committee has scrambled to make adjustments to fill holes. In light of all this, Macleod thanked Copenhaver should for the remarkable support and assistance that she provided to not only the PC but also to
him as Program Chair. He thanked Medeiros for her work on the 2022 program, especially the last-minute adjustments she made in the immediate lead-up to the conference.

In regards to the difficulties recruiting chairs and commentators, PC Members rely heavily on volunteer lists to find chairs and commentators. Those lists are extremely valuable and helpful. There were two small problems with the lists when planning Pacific 2022. First, there was a glitch in Aqua, the Pacific Division’s bespoke computer program, that temporarily eliminated the volunteer list. Fortunately, Dom Lopes was able to quickly resolve the issue quickly—many thanks to him for that and for his maintenance of Aqua. The second issue was that there was an unfortunate instance in which a commentator who was selected from the volunteer list turned out to be an undergraduate student and thus not a suitable commentator. The volunteer’s status was only discovered in the week before the meeting because they didn’t provide the speaker with any comments. Fortunately, we were able to find a replacement commentator. While this seems like a highly anomalous case, it raises the question as to whether some vetting process is needed for volunteers. Copenhaver explained that we can’t vet volunteers because we don’t have the time or the staff. What she will do in the future is better communicate that PCMs should Google volunteers before assigning them. Copenhaver and Macleod emphasized that none of this is to denigrate the PCM involved in this situation, who did a fantastic job and isn’t at fault for what happened.

A few participants who requested AV equipment stated that they did not receive any notice that their request had been processed and approved. Macleod is not sure what happened in those few cases, but the anxiety that the participants experienced should be noted. In a different vein, participants seem to communicate questions/concerns in various and potentially inefficient ways. Some messages about the program were sent to a first point of contact (Copenhaver, Medeiros, a PCM, or sometimes Ferrer) and then forwarded to Macleod. Eighty percent of the time those messages should have been directed to Macleod as Program Chair. This may be unavoidable, but it also may be worth considering whether participants should be encouraged to communicate directly with the Program Chair. Copenhaver said that the Pacific Division page on the APA’s website only lists her name as the point of contact, but we can change that in the future to list the current Program Chair if they are so willing. Vaidya recalled that as the incoming Chair, he sometimes received emails regarding Pacific 2022 that he had to forward to Macleod. He agreed to have his email address listed on the APA website.

**Bright Spots:** The Program Chair’s Report often identifies areas of specialization that need to be filled in for the next PC for the incoming chair to use. Thanks to Vaidya, the 2023 Program Chair, this isn’t necessary: he has taken a pro-active approach and is already familiar with the PC’s situation. The 2023 Program Committee is in good hands.

Macleod thanked the 2022 Program Committee for their hard work in vetting papers, creating sessions, and trouble-shooting. When it came it creating inviting sessions, there were very few issues and Macleod was able easily manage any gaps. The Committee was professional, collegial, and resourceful.

Vaidya asked about the double-appearance rule and whether we should allow a person who is willing to chair multiple divisional sessions to chair, say, three divisional sessions. (Under
the Pacific Division’s implementation of the double-appearance rule, a participant may only appear on the divisional/main program once in any role, including chair. Information on how the other Divisions implement the double-appearance rule is available at: https://www.apaonline.org/page/papersubmission.) Copenhaver replied that the only reason we don’t allow people to chair multiple divisional sessions is because of how difficult it would make program scheduling. Ferrer said that since the Pacific meeting has twenty or so concurrent sessions, allowing someone to chair multiple divisional sessions would almost guarantee a conflict. Copenhaver explained that when scheduling sessions, we aren’t just concerned about a time conflict: we also try to avoid conflicts between session topics.

15. APPOINTMENTS TO THE PROGRAM COMMITTEE (XC Committee): Copenhaver assembled names for the Program Committee. She also thanked the Program Committee members for their service.

16. PROGRAM CHAIR APPOINTMENTS (XC Committee): The XC Committee recommended a list of names for possible future Chair of the Program Committee. Anand Vaidya was welcomed as the Program Chair for 2023.

17. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA OF THE ABM (XC Committee): The Annual Business Meeting agenda was approved.

18. ANY OTHER BUSINESS (Sager): Shiffrin noticed that 2024 is Pacific Division’s hundredth anniversary and asked if the other Divisions did anything on their anniversaries. Ferrer said she believes the other Division’s anniversaries were marked, but she isn’t sure how because they occurred before she joined the APA. Copenhaver suggested a fundraising opportunity and Shiffrin asked if there is anything that we’d like to endow. Sager suggested that the anniversary could be an opportunity to shake things up as discussed earlier in the meeting. The XC briefly discussed alternate talk formats, such as flash talks and read-aheads. Any alternate format would have to be brought before the XC.

Satz suggested an endowment that serves low-income attendees because the recent survey mentioned the expense of attendance. Ferrer said the diversity and inclusiveness grants come out of operating funds, so the Pacific Division could endow them. Copenhaver suggested endowing travel grants and Ferrer noted that we always have more demand for travel funding. Satz agreed these were good options.

19. ADJOURNMENT (Sager): The meeting was adjourned at 5:36 PM.
MINUTES OF THE 2022 BUSINESS MEETING

Westin Bayshore, Vancouver
Thursday, April 14, 2022

1. CALL TO ORDER: The meeting came to order at 12:02 PM.

2. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: The Pacific Division of the American Philosophical Association acknowledges that it meets this year on the unceded traditional territory of the Musqueam, Squamish, and Tsleil-Waututh Nations.

3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA: The agenda was adopted.

4. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES: The minutes were adopted as published on the APA website.

5. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES: No matters arising from the minutes.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS (Shiffrin): The names of APA members who had passed away since the last meeting were read and a moment of silence was observed.

7. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE (Copenhaver): Evan Thompson (chair), Hannah Ginsborg, Ralph Wedgwood, and Rebecca Copenhaver (ex officio) served as the 2021-22 nominating committee. The committee nominates the following for terms beginning July 1, 2022: Margaret Gilbert for Vice President, Carolyn Dicey Jennings for Member-at-Large, and Rebecca Copenhaver for Secretary-Treasurer.

   After reading the report, Copenhaver left the meeting. Alex Sager conducted the membership’s vote and Copenhaver was not present for it.

   The nominating committee’s nominations were unanimously approved.

8. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER (Copenhaver): The Secretary-Treasurer summarized her remarks from the meeting of the Executive Committee. (See XC minutes.) While having to cancel the Pacific 2020 meeting was a financial hit, thanks to Ferrer’s assistance, we were able to negotiate an agreement with the hotel that involved minimal financial liability. This doesn’t make up for the loss of not having the meeting but together the hotel agreement and Ferrer’s securing of many grants and forgivable government loans means that financial consequences of cancelling Pacific 2020 haven’t affected us too terribly.

   Copenhaver noted three proposals that the XC discussed yesterday. First, the bylaws amendments, which is up for review at this meeting. Second, the proposal that the three Divisions split yearly accommodation costs equally amongst them. The Eastern and Central Divisions already voted to approve that proposal and the XC voted to approve it yesterday.
Finally, the XC discussed the 2 + 1 model proposed by Philosophers of Sustainability (see XC minutes). The proposal is that one Divisional meeting per year would be held virtually, and that the virtual meeting would rotate between the Divisions. The XC voted to join the Central and Eastern Divisions in experimenting with the 2 + 1 model. The Eastern and Pacific Divisions have hotels booked through 2025, so the first virtual meeting will be the Central 2025 conference because that is the first opportunity to do so. A task force will be created immediately to, among other things, determine what specific measurements will be measured by the experiment.

A member of Philosophers for Sustainability asked if we have a sense of which costs from the hybrid conferences during the pandemic were associated with being hybrid (e.g., Zoom hosting platform). Copenhaver responded that none of the APA conferences have been hybrid. For example, because of the Omicron variant, the Eastern 2022 meeting had to be split at the last minute into an in-person conference and a virtual conference—the latter occurring after the in-person conference ended. A hybrid conference involves both in-person and virtual programming in the actual hotel rooms, and the APA has never done that. The Divisional Coordinating Committee has unanimously agreed that a hybrid conference isn’t sustainable for the APA because of how hotels price their AV and the room-block percentage we have to meet in order to have spaces for sessions.

There was a misunderstanding as to whether the virtual component of Eastern 2022 had people attending in-person (it did not), so the question was revised to ask whether we have a sense of costs in comparing the virtual APA meetings with past in-person meetings. Ferrer said that for the 2021 virtual conferences, which were pre-vaccine and when virtual technology was still fairly new, we ended up with a modest budget surplus for those meetings and so the costs worked out. However, when the Eastern Division had to add a virtual component to its 2022 meeting, that virtual component cost more than the fully virtual Eastern 2021 meeting—despite the 2022 meeting being shorter and being about half the size (both were on the same platform). That is all to say that we don’t really know what the costs will be because this technology is still developing and the pricing is changing. As we approach the first virtual conference as part of the 2 + 1 model, we’re going to need a lot of research not only in regards what type of platforms to use but also how those meetings will be conducted. We don’t want to just assume that the types of sessions that work in-person work virtually. The past virtual meetings’ programming had to be the same as in-person programming because of where we were in the planning process when those meetings went virtual, but that will not be the case with virtual meetings planned under the 2 + 1 model. Platforms’ pricing models vary (e.g., by session, time) and we will need to price registration to cover costs as we do with in-person meetings. Thus, past virtual meetings didn’t tell us much about planning virtual meetings going forward. Copenhaver said that one thing we did learn from past virtual meetings is what our staffing needs will be. It isn’t sustainable to ask the nine National Office staff members to handle virtual meetings alone and platform-sourced support can’t provide help with, e.g., conference registration issues. Something else that affects our current ability to estimate costs is that in the past, we were able to get great hotel rates because we could agree that, e.g., all three Divisions would go with a particular hotel chain in one year or that a particular Division would book at a particular hotel more than once. We don’t know if the 2 + 1 model will affect our ability to bargain with hotels in that way.
Philosophers for Sustainability are happy to help with the task force. Copenhaver thanked them for their willingness to serve.

9. REPORT OF THE PACIFIC DIVISION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (Sager): The Chair of the Executive Committee summarized the actions of the Committee that weren’t already highlighted during this meeting by Copenhaver. (See XC minutes.) Serving as Program Chair is always a heroic effort, but Colin Macleod deserves special acknowledgement for his many efforts. Anand Vaidya, the incoming Program Chair, is extremely on-the-ball: he knew which PC Members were rotating off and needed to be replaced before the XC Meeting. Sager has great hopes and expectations for Vaidya as Program Chair. He gave special thanks to Copenhaver and Ferrer for everything they have done to keep the APA and Pacific Division afloat over the past few years. Sager thanked Philosophers for Sustainability for bringing the 2 + 1 model to the APA and noted what an exciting opportunity the model gives us,

10. REPORT OF THE APA BOARD OF OFFICERS (Ferrer): Ferrer summarized her report to the Executive Committee. (See XC minutes.)

Dom Lopes, Chair of the Board, added that as Burroughs and Copenhaver alluded, we owe Ferrer and the National Office staff a huge debt of gratitude. While he is sure that every chair has expressed their thanks in the past, this is the time when we really have to mean it. It has been a rough two years for us, for Ferrer and the APA staff, for everyone.

11. PROPOSED BYLAWS AMENDMENTS: Ferrer summarized the proposed bylaws amendments (see XC minutes). The proposed bylaws amendments have to be reviewed at the Divisional Annual Business Meetings and then they go before the membership for a vote. Since the Pacific ABM is chronologically last, they will go before the membership in the coming weeks.

12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS: There was no other business.

13. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 12:41 PM.